

Docket No.: 29985/05-119US  
(PATENT)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

In re Patent Application of: Eduardo Chi Sing et al.

Application No.: 10/557,333

Confirmation No.: 9448

Filed: November 21, 2005

Art Unit: Not yet assigned

For: Improved System and Method for Facilitating  
Hemostasis with an Absorbable Sponge

Examiner: 3731

---

**REQUEST TO CORRECT FILING RECEIPT**  
**AND TO CLARIFY APPLICANT STATUS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Commissioner:

Applicant respectfully requests that the filing receipt for this application be corrected. More specifically, applicant is not, nor has it ever claimed to be, a small entity. Accordingly, please issue a corrected filing receipt that properly identifies the applicant as a "large entity."

As previously noted in applicant's Response to the Notice of Missing Parts submitted on November 20, 2006, at no time has applicant indicated that it is a small entity. Instead, the data sheet submitted with the application clearly indicates that small entity status was not being claimed. Accordingly, to the extent any of the papers submitted in the application are construed as an indication of small entity status, applicants explicitly withdraw any such notice.


Furthermore, it appears that applicant has not been charged the correct fee for this application. By applicant's count, it would appear that the filing fee should be \$2,130, which would include: (1) the Basic national fee of \$300; (2) the Examination fee of \$200; (3) the Search fee of \$100 (since the USPTO was the ISA during the international phase); (4) the extra claims fee of \$1,400; and (5) the surcharge of \$130 for submitting the executed declaration. The Filing Receipt, however, indicates that the "filing fee rec'd" for this application is \$1730, and therefore would appear to be \$400 too low.

Applicants respectfully request that the Office review the payment records to determine whether the appropriate large entity fee has been received. Applicants have attempted to pay the proper amount in the past, most recently in the Response to Missing Parts filed on November 20, 2006. Upon reviewing the records in private PAIR, however, applicant is unable to decipher the meaning and effect of some of the internal USPTO documents referred to as "Fee Calculation Sheets," and therefore the appropriate fee still may not have been charged. Accordingly, please review the fees paid in this application and advise applicant if additional fees are due at the large entity rate.

Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you have any questions or need additional information.

Dated: June 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Brent E. Matthias  
Registration No.: 41,974  
MILLER, MATTHIAS & HULL  
One North Franklin Street  
Suite 2350  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 977-9904  
Attorney for Applicants